

## FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

+ + + + +

## PUBLIC SAFETY NATIONAL COORDINATION COMMITTEE

+ + + + +

## IMPLEMENTATION SUBCOMMITTEE

+ + + + +

THURSDAY  
MAY 30, 2002

+ + + + +

The Implementation Subcommittee met in the Commission Meeting Room, Federal Communications Commission, 445 12th Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. at 1:00 p.m., Edward Dempsey, Subcommittee Chair, presiding:

MEMBERS PRESENT:

David Buchanan  
Steve Devine  
John Powell  
Robert Schlieman  
Michael Wilhelm  
Rich Murphy  
Jeanne Kowalski  
David Eierman  
Bob Speidel, Esq.  
Sean O'Hara  
John Oblak  
Carl Kain  
Glen Nash  
Tom Tolman  
Wayne Leland  
Norm Coltri  
Edward Dempsey

**NEAL R. GROSS**COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

MEMBERS PRESENT (continued):

Fred Griffin  
David Funk  
Bette Rinehart  
David Pickeral

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

1:07 p.m.

MR. DEMPSEY: This is the Implementation Subcommittee. There was an agenda out on the table. Just want to get the agenda approved in the matter of business. I don't think there is any problems with it. Any changes or objections. We are going to start with Dave Eierman. He is going to give us the latest on DTV update.

MR. EIERMAN: Okay, a lot has happened. I want to give you a little update on the auctions. Let's start with auction 44, the easy one. The lower 700 megahertz which is channels 50 through 69 is still scheduled for June 19. However, last Friday, auction 31 for the upper 700 megahertz, which is what we are concerned with, the channels adjacent to the public safety, was delayed about another 7 months until January 14, 2003.

A lot of Congressional activity related to this. A bunch of bills introduced for delaying the auctions and some to hold the auctions. But basically the reasons cited by the FCC was the number of

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 outstanding technical issues and some of the must  
2 carry issues could still effect clearing of this band.

3 Some of it is probably related to the  
4 proposal to reorganize the 800 megahertz band which  
5 some of the proposals relate to placing some of those  
6 people into the 700 megahertz band or reorganizing  
7 parts of the 700 band. So that auction for our  
8 portion of the 700 band, the commercial portion has  
9 been delayed.

10 As far as band clearing, the FCC  
11 introduced an NPRM seeking comments on measures it  
12 should take to basically sanctions against the  
13 broadcasters who fail to meet their construction  
14 deadlines. You now , there is some discussion about,  
15 you know, there is a lot of people that have missed  
16 their deadlines and what should be done about.

17 And there are several proposals in this  
18 Notice of Proposal Rule Making. I think it is FCC02-  
19 150. About every six months, increasing the levels of  
20 sanctions against people who don't meet their  
21 construction deadlines.

22 That document also clarified that the four

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 networked, the top four network affiliates which I  
2 think is ABC, NBC, CBS and Fox. In the top 30 markets  
3 have to be operating at full power. Should have been  
4 operating at full power, I guess, November a year and  
5 a half ago. That there is some stations that are  
6 allowed to operate at minimum facilities in the other  
7 markets, but the top 30 markets, the top four  
8 affiliates are supposed to be operating at full power.

9 Very little Canadian activity. They had  
10 NPRM out last year about opening up this band to land  
11 mobile. Been little or no activity on that. There is  
12 some discussion that later this year they may issue a  
13 time line for DTV migration in Canada.

14 The Digital Television Taskforce, no  
15 published activities that I can report. Again I  
16 already mentioned Congressional activity about the  
17 bills to delay and not delay the auctions. There was,  
18 last week, an amendment to the Bioterrorism bill. To  
19 allow some analog stations that had an application in  
20 by sometime in 1991 and hadn't received their  
21 allocation by 1997 when the list of DTV allocations  
22 came out. For those stations to be able to apply and

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 go back and get a DTV allocation. As far as I can  
2 tell, it only affects a handful of stations. And  
3 possibly only two, one in Charolottsville, Virginia  
4 and one in Fredericksburg, Texas that even affect 700  
5 megahertz.

6 And you know if you have seen the coverage  
7 interference plots or maps I have done before, I did  
8 not include those two stations on it. Because the  
9 assumption is that they would never be placed on the  
10 air. So have to go back and look at that to see  
11 whether they applied for stations or not.

12 Status report on the DTV transition.  
13 There are some difference between what the national  
14 association of broadcasters reports and what the FCC  
15 reports. National Association of Broadcasters as of  
16 two weeks ago, said there were 410 DTV stations on the  
17 air in 125 television markets. That is out of 200 and  
18 some different television markets.

19 The FCC says there are 457 that have  
20 constructed and that are on the air. So there is some  
21 difference there. But, the issue is, it is still only  
22 about 1/4 of the total. And probably about 1/3 of the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 ones that were supposed to be on the air by May 1st.

2 A lot of stations, 909, asked for  
3 extensions, which is basically, you add 450 and 900  
4 that is 1300 number of commercial stations. Only about  
5 half of those have granted extensions. Some were  
6 denied. There are about 300 still pending and there  
7 are even a few stations who never filed an application  
8 for DTV station. And there are some stations that  
9 didn't meet the May 1st date and didn't file for  
10 extension. So the FCC page is being updated about  
11 once a month now. So if you can go to the FCC Media  
12 Web Site and look at the DTV application page, the  
13 information is there. Any questions?

14 MR. DEMPSEY: Thank you David. Tom Tolman  
15 is going to give us a report on the Funding Work  
16 Group.

17 MR. TOLMAN: Okay, the Funding Working  
18 Group, actually we have as Working Group 5, was 6, now  
19 5. And we have mentioned this in previous meetings  
20 that we have taken a two prong approach. It is a two  
21 pronged effort.

22 One is focusing on the high level amounts

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 of funding and we are all watching. And I say we, the  
2 public safety community. Including the NPSTC group  
3 and others are watching this Homeland Security Funding  
4 to 3.5 billion to support first respond. We know that  
5 there is language in there that talks about equipment  
6 and those types of things. And point here is that we  
7 will be closely monitoring that to see how and if in  
8 any way that that can find its way into the work we  
9 are doing if related at all possible.

10 Then the other, also that we will continue  
11 our partnership as we did in times past with the PSWN  
12 Group. That is, I don't know if Rick is here? He had  
13 to leave for a meeting. So that I could speak as  
14 proxy that the PSWN program has agreed to assist in  
15 developing some tangible documents and really getting  
16 out there and doing some real research over the summer  
17 with regard to the high level funding.

18 On the local level, the RPC or the  
19 Regional Planning Funding, I would like to ask David  
20 Funk, who is the data base administer for this CAPRAD  
21 data base and also responsible again through the NPTSC  
22 support office and oversight person for the Regional

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)



1 Planning Funding. David?

2 MR. FUNK: Basically Tom, we concluded the  
3 2001 RPC program. We have funded 29 RPC groups with  
4 \$2500.00 a piece. For a total of \$72,500.00 that has  
5 been in the hands of the Regional Planning groups.  
6 For the regional planning groups for 2002, there will  
7 be \$30,000.00 available which will fund 12 RPC's,  
8 which have not been funded before. We weren't able to  
9 secure funding that would allow second helpings to the  
10 original RPC's that have been funded. But 12 more  
11 will be funded during this year.

12 MR. DEMPSEY: Do you want to do the  
13 database?

14 MR. TOLMAN: Let's go ahead. Once again,  
15 one more time, we'll call our database administrator  
16 to the mic to give us an update on the databases.

17 MR. FUNK: Basically, we are considering  
18 the database in initial operating capability. We have  
19 actually proceeded with all of the functions and  
20 testing. We have actually loaded Dave Buchanan's plan  
21 into the database and we are playing with it. As soon  
22 as he gets me the actual data, we are actually going

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to populate his states piece of the data base with the  
2 allocations that he put in his plan.

3 His plan is actually living out there now  
4 and we have had different people going in and testing  
5 and accessing and doing those kinds of things. We do  
6 have programmers working on finalizing the electronic  
7 batch formatting issues that still exist. And those  
8 are well under way. But those are in the licensing  
9 side of it. So we see no reason why we can't begin to  
10 roll out. And intend to begin the actual training in  
11 the database to regional planning committees very  
12 soon.

13 We are trying to time the roll out of that  
14 training to the availability of the regional planning  
15 guides and the actual documents that the printing of  
16 the manuals for the CAPRAD system that we want to hand  
17 to the people that come for the training. So we are  
18 anticipating that by the end of June or the middle of  
19 July, we will actually rolling out of the first  
20 training program and we'll have active users on the  
21 database doing planning and everybody being able to  
22 review Dave's plan by the middle of the summer.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. DEMPSEY: Great. Thanks David.

2 MR. TOLMAN: Thanks David.

3 MR. DEMPSEY: Since we started to talk a  
4 little bit about the Regional plans through Dave's  
5 little segway. I ask Bette Rinehard who has been  
6 tracking the Regional Plans formations through our  
7 implementation subcommittee. She is going to give an  
8 update on where the Regional plans are and how they  
9 are moving forward.

10 MS. RINEHART: Okay, according to my  
11 records, there are 34 Regional Planning Committees  
12 have either formed or set a date for their first  
13 meeting. And of those, 12 were formed this year. So  
14 this is really picking up speed. Four additional ones  
15 have at least selected a convener, but haven't  
16 necessarily set a date yet. So that is 38 all  
17 together. And in one region has submitted its plan to  
18 the FCC and that is Region five.

19 MR. DEMPSEY: Okay, Tom, back to you again  
20 on the Regional Plan Guidebook.

21 MR. TOLMAN: Okay. In reference to the  
22 RPC or the Guidebook that we have been talking about.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1       A lot of work has taken place since we last met and  
2 most importantly we now have primarily through the  
3 efforts of the team that we have had. That is John  
4 Powell here.

5               We now have a near final, or we can call  
6 it final, version. And we have one document. Do we  
7 have a hard copy? Not here yet, but we will have a  
8 hard copy to present to Mr. Wilhelm and also to -- Do  
9 we have anything to present here? Okay I will have  
10 two hard copies here tomorrow and then we will also,  
11 we may have some CD-ROMs available too. So we are  
12 there and ready to deliver.

13              MR. DEMPSEY: From what I understand from  
14 talking to Tom and John to, is that they have got some  
15 really good ideas on how to keep this updated, how  
16 much I think we have discussed prior to this meeting,  
17 but, it might John, if you could just step up and talk  
18 about it. The Guidebook is obviously going to be a  
19 living document as pieces are updated, there has got  
20 to be a process that we can post updates to the NPSTC.

21              MR. POWELL: The plan is the Guidebook  
22 will come out and we are printing 125 of them Tom, I

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 think is what we have decided. So that each of the  
2 RPC chairs and each SIEC chair where there formed will  
3 get a copy of the guidebook in loose leaf form so that  
4 we can do updates to it.

5 There was significant discussion over the  
6 past few weeks within the implementation subcommittee  
7 that resulted in the re-writing of the Appendix. The  
8 very technical Appendix that Dave Eierman originally  
9 put together, incorporating some other ideas from some  
10 other people on different methodologies for doing  
11 coordination with regard to interference limited  
12 versus other alternatives.

13 And what we have decided to do is to leave  
14 that appendix as it was re-written and in a separate  
15 section of the book where we have alternative  
16 methodologies, we'll highlight some of the other  
17 possibilities. For example, as this other California  
18 Region did with their plan. And also in that section  
19 we are going to include as we see these plans come  
20 in, some of the good ideas that are coming up out  
21 other plans, as an example, coming out of Northern  
22 California, the ability to at a Regional level have a

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Regional Plan Review Committee that has a couple of  
2 technical people who are authorized by the Committee  
3 between meetings to approve plans based on the  
4 applicant meeting all of the requirements of the  
5 committee.

6 So that they are not held up until the  
7 committee has the next full meeting to push that  
8 forward. And there are some other ideas that are  
9 coming from other committees around the country or  
10 that were in the 800 NPSPAC plans. That are just  
11 going to be good material I think for planning  
12 committees to look at and get some ideas on some of  
13 the innovations we have seen around the country.

14 Again, what we want to do is we'll post the new  
15 information or revisions to the NPSTC web site so that  
16 people can simply print them out and put them in the  
17 book as up dates occur.

18 MR. DEMPSEY: Thank you.

19 MR. DEVINE: Steve Devine, State of  
20 Missouri. One quick question. Has there been any  
21 discussion regarding the modifications of the plans  
22 living on the database will also be living documents

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and they are going to be changing pretty regularly as  
2 well. Is Commission approval of the plans right now,  
3 the process is probably considerably different than  
4 what is going to be effective for the databases. Has  
5 there been any discussions regarding approval to  
6 changes to the documents that are residing on the  
7 database and any mechanism for that. And I am really  
8 asking David?

9 MR. FUNK: The database is designed so  
10 that the documents that you submit, whatever is the  
11 most recent, that is the one that will be the official  
12 one. The Regional Planning chair as the authority to  
13 submit that document. So if you put on up there in  
14 PDF format, which is the standard file holding as your  
15 final plan. If there are documents within your  
16 Regional Plan that change, you simply change those  
17 within your Regional Plan and submit the new document  
18 PDF. The old one is taken out, archived and the new  
19 one is in its place.

20 MR. DEVINE: My question was, does that  
21 require FCC approval?

22 MR. DEMPSEY: And we, in the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 implementation subcommittee made some recommendations  
2 which I don't think the FCC yet has come out with the  
3 rulings on those recommendations. So --

4 MR. DEVINE: Well the term living  
5 document, reminded me not only are the RPC guidebook  
6 going to be, but the plans themselves.

7 MR. DEMPSEY: We always intended for the  
8 plans to be living documents as they are revised, the  
9 updates will be put into the database as well as for  
10 the old plan administrator to have a document that  
11 changes for the needs. And we did address that in one  
12 of the sections of recommendations.

13 We addressed that minor changes to the  
14 plan be made without FCC approval. And that hasn't  
15 been ruled on by the FCC yet.

16 MR. EIERMAN: I think we have discussed  
17 minimum signal levels enough. Anybody want to touch  
18 minimum signal level discussion again?

19 MR. DEMPSEY: It was on the Agenda.

20 MR. EIERMAN: Make sure it is taken care  
21 of, we don't want to touch it again.

22 MR. DEMPSEY: One of the things to the, I

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 have to apologize. The agenda that we have here, I  
2 sent the wrong one to Michael. There was a change in  
3 the agenda and I should have brought that to our  
4 attention earlier, but several meetings past and the  
5 most recent meeting, we spent some time discussing, it  
6 wasn't really a proposal by Fred, but it was a  
7 discussion led by Fred Griffin on some kind of  
8 national infrastructure for interoperability and in  
9 talking on the list server and there has been some  
10 exchanges about this. We thought we would spend a few  
11 more minutes up date what Fred has dug up if anything.

12 As Michael's last request at the last meeting was to  
13 go into this a little bit further. And then open up  
14 some discussion on whether we should proceed or not.  
15 Looking at this and making any recommendations to the  
16 Steering Committee. So Fred, do you just want to give  
17 a little recap of what we started and then we will  
18 pick it up from there.

19 MR. GRIFFIN: Okay, I'll separate my  
20 comments into two parts, history and what has happened  
21 last meeting and I will take the second part first.  
22 Nothing has transpired in our office or have I talked

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to anybody about what was discussed at the last  
2 meeting other than I repeated it yesterday to NPSPAC.

3 And I would suggest that I repeat it again today for  
4 those of you who may not have been here at our last  
5 meeting.

6 And the last meeting of this committee  
7 followed the last PSWN meeting in Charleston. In  
8 Charleston, I saw two presentations that there was not  
9 discussion of but I just made an observation and I  
10 brought it into this meeting. One had to do with the  
11 state of North Carolina and the so called NCC Network.

12 Which is the network that is formed, proprietary  
13 network based on Motorola Smart Net Systems. But the  
14 requirement as they saw it and explained it is that  
15 when they have an incident in state. And apparently  
16 there is some sort of conglomeration of people often  
17 happen near the beach. And I won't go further than  
18 that.

19 But anyway, when they have one of those  
20 situations, at the beach. They call appropriate  
21 support from across the state whether it be law  
22 enforcement, fire, or EMS. And their requirement this

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that when they call for that particular person or  
2 group of people, they come fully equipped. Which  
3 means they bring their radio with them. They want the  
4 radio to work from the time they leave that  
5 jurisdiction until wherever it is their going to. An  
6 if perhaps the battery is dead, they swap the battery  
7 out or the antenna gets broke on the portable, they  
8 change that.

9 Basically this is their concept for  
10 seamless communications interoperability consistency.  
11 That was on thing that was presented down there. The  
12 other, I think was the second time I have heard it and  
13 I have heard it twice since then, for those of you  
14 interested you can pull it off the Congressional  
15 record and it was also given at the last Notella  
16 meeting by Steve Souder having to do with the  
17 situation here in COG and Pentagon situation.

18 And the situation in summary is after Air  
19 Florida, approximately 20 years ago now, COG decided  
20 they needed a common set of equipment seamless, mutual  
21 aid. And it hinged on two terms. One is called  
22 mutual aid, the other is called mutual resource. The

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 concept at COG is that they want a mutual resource.  
2 Which means all the same equipment.

3 And as history has developed, Arlington  
4 went out for a competitive procurement. It was  
5 competitive, Motorola was selected as a vendor, the  
6 system went in and all the other systems on a variety  
7 of reasons picked the same kind of equipment. So  
8 within COG you had the seamless interoperability  
9 situation which lay there in the planning stage until  
10 the Pentagon hit and then it showed its colors. And  
11 since that time Steve announced down at Charleston is  
12 that the same concept has been spread now from North  
13 of Baltimore to South of Washington, some place,  
14 probably COG. You have a seamless one vendor,  
15 proprietary, so you have basically a situation where  
16 you have a monopolistic situation, you got only one  
17 vendor. But it does provide the interoperability as  
18 they define it. That is what I kind of started the  
19 discussion with the last time at this meeting and  
20 where we left it when raised the issue of time and  
21 charter and I guess Michael has ruled we can talk  
22 about it because it now on the Agenda as part of our

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 activities. So you can say what you want.

2 I suggested that the term interoperability  
3 be better defined. And in the real world and as I see  
4 it from going to conventions and to clients,  
5 interoperability means full feature set. The other  
6 term, which I am suggested be added to the vocabulary  
7 or the glossary is interconnect ability. Which is the  
8 kind of thing you are talking on. Interoperability  
9 now where you have the conventional repeater. And  
10 that is where we left it before we decided whether we  
11 should go further with it and for those of you who  
12 weren't here last time, the issue whether we could  
13 talk further was passed up to the Steering Committee  
14 who passed it off to Michael or interpretation of the  
15 FCC and my understanding is we can talk about it if we  
16 so choose.

17 MR. DEMPSEY: Any comments? Any  
18 discussion on this issue? And I think it is an issue  
19 that you know, interoperability, the interoperability  
20 subcommittee is dealing with as far as the standards  
21 go, and I think this is the issue which I had earlier  
22 conversations with John Powell about how Regional

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 interoperability is probably going to be the most  
2 important piece in the next couple of years because of  
3 the incidents like the Pentagon and World Trade  
4 Centers. And that should probably be a focus of the  
5 Agencies that are concerned about interoperable  
6 communications in that particular areas.

7 I think the discussion here is, and I will  
8 probably need a little bit of clarification, but you  
9 know, there is a couple of levels of how we do this,  
10 you know. Obviously it would take a ton of money and  
11 we discussed this the last time. A ton of money and  
12 years of development to build a network that would be  
13 nationwide. Even though the cellular carriers and  
14 other carriers have them already. But there is a  
15 different drive to get those systems built.

16 And to change subjects just real quick, as  
17 far as the definitions of interoperability and  
18 interconnectivity go, if we need to redefine those,  
19 they should be, I think we should bring them up  
20 possibly on the list server of the interoperability  
21 subcommittee and then by September, that issue could  
22 be resolved. One way or another whether we decide to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 change the definition or add definitions that would be  
2 up to you as a subcommittee.

3 But getting back to the issue, I think we  
4 have to get our hands around this as an issue. So we  
5 have to decide what the issue is here. Is it that out  
6 subcommittee wants to recommend an national  
7 infrastructure, national standards? And I think that  
8 is the hard part that I am dealing with it is what is  
9 it that we want to get out of this discussion. If it  
10 is making the recommendation to, as we discussed at  
11 the last meeting to pursue an national infrastructure,  
12 I think that is out of our purview. So I think it  
13 might not be a bad idea to get some discussion on what  
14 path we should follow, if any, on this issue.

15 MR. POWELL: And I think to a degree with  
16 what is going on in Congress, in within the Federal  
17 Government now with regards to some funding for  
18 systems. It is important from an implementation  
19 standpoint to look at it. And since I don't see  
20 Harlan McEwan in the room, I just want to briefly  
21 summarize some of the activities that have been going  
22 on primarily spearheaded by three groups within both

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the administration and the Congress looking towards  
2 the potential for some funding, some major funding.

3 First of all, that group includes, by the  
4 way the police chiefs, the fire chiefs and APCO  
5 representing the management of the 911 dispatch  
6 centers. And they have in general, adopted a much  
7 simpler definition of interoperability than even his  
8 resident in the PSWN report. Which is what we adopted  
9 for the NCC. And it is the ability to talk to who I  
10 need to talk to when I need to talk to them. And it is  
11 not the ability to talk to everyone all the time.

12 Beyond that, they have established three  
13 levels of priority in looking at implementing systems.

14 And I think anyone from a management level or a  
15 public safety agency management level in this room is  
16 going to say that the first priority, I don't care  
17 whether I can talk to my neighbor or not. If I can't  
18 talk to my own people, I have got a problem.

19 So the first level of implementation for  
20 systems has got to be to provide the capability for  
21 agencies to talk to their own people on their own  
22 systems. And by the way, if we do that right with the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)



1 appropriate standards and guidelines, they'll be  
2 building an interoperability base line into that  
3 system.

4 The second level as Ted just referred to  
5 as regional interoperability. After I can talk to my  
6 own people, I need to be able to talk to my neighbors  
7 on a regional basis. And by the way, if we build the  
8 appropriate guidelines into that, then we are setting  
9 the basics that we need for the third level which is  
10 national interoperability so that when we have a major  
11 incident, and I am not looking at so much the World  
12 Trade Center as I am what happens year in and year out  
13 across the country with the fires that we have in the  
14 west. And the hurricanes in the South and so on where  
15 we can bring those resources from neighboring states  
16 or from a whole group of states, potentially. And  
17 they can at least of a minimum level of  
18 interoperability.

19 In my opinion it does not mean you are  
20 bringing across all the feature sets. It means that  
21 we have the ability to talk back and forth. We do not  
22 have to have every single bell and whistle in that

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 equipment working to have interoperability. It means  
2 that we have a basic level of communication. Now you  
3 can talk about up and down, what the level is, but at  
4 least we can communicate and that is data as well as  
5 voice. Although primarily today is voice.

6 In a nutshell, that is where the  
7 leadership of the lack of a better term, the first  
8 responders in this country. Again IACP representing  
9 the police chiefs. IAFC representing the fire and EMS  
10 services are coming from today.

11 MR. GRIFFIN: I have a piece of paper that  
12 has Motorola name on it. It was given out at the  
13 Motorola consultant seminar last week. It is not  
14 classified as proprietary in any manner. I would like  
15 to request of Motorola, this well prepared document,  
16 be somehow distributed somehow or another. I am  
17 hesitant about handing out because it is Motorola's  
18 work.

19 But let me tell you the essence of it and  
20 why I think it is a great piece of work. It defines  
21 interoperability in terms of six levels. And at the  
22 consultant seminar there was much discussion when this

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 came up on the screen. But basically the first four  
2 levels are on interconnect ability so you can talk one  
3 way or the other. And the 5th and 6th levels are  
4 basically interoperability, the 5th level being a  
5 system where you can do roaming and so forth. But it  
6 may be on a vendor proprietary whatever. And the 6th  
7 level is in essence a Project 25 so you have a  
8 national standard.

9 But I think this a great document. I  
10 don't know who in Motorola generated or what group,  
11 but I think it ought to be put in the public domain.  
12 But I am not going to do that.

13 MR. EIERMAN: Since I saw Chuck Jackson,  
14 give that presentation about three or four months ago,  
15 I assume chuck is going to be here tonight. I guess  
16 we can call Chuck and ask if that can be distributed  
17 or not. I can describe it to Chuck. I am pretty sure  
18 he knows what it is. -- Motorola. I was going to  
19 follow up on that with Chuck.

20 MR. GRIFFIN: I don't know the source of  
21 all the material. I just know the end product is a  
22 great product.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1                   MR. EIERMAN: Well that is just a generic  
2 discussion of the different levels of interoperability  
3 and who can talk to who and that is defining it in the  
4 six different levels.

5                   MR. GRIFFIN: And the greatest part about  
6 this document is the first four levels in that  
7 consultant seminar knows 28 consultants, plus who  
8 knows how many Motorola people in the room, about 30  
9 people. The bottom four levels are really  
10 interconnect ability in one form or another. Fifth  
11 and sixth levels are interoperability and one is by  
12 default or whatever. For example, in Central Virginia  
13 you have interoperability, but proprietary to MA/COM  
14 because it is a MA/COM System. And likewise in COG,  
15 you have got interoperability but is propriety to  
16 Motorola because they are Motorola's but 6 is the  
17 Project 25 interoperability. It is just a great talk  
18 document.

19                  MR. BUCHANAN: Dave Buchanan, county of  
20 San Berdino. Just a question Fred. I get a little  
21 confused or not quite sure because when you talk about  
22 the interoperability and the COG system is it? And

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1     you say the equipment is the same so they can swap  
2     antennas and things like that, which implies that it  
3     has to be a propriety system, but then you also  
4     mention on that document Project 25 as  
5     interoperability, but Project 25 doesn't define that  
6     all the equipment is the same that you can swap an  
7     antenna from one to the other, have it in stock. I  
8     guess what I'm getting at is how you envision getting  
9     from if we had this system we would almost have to  
10    have standards that said this is how you have to make  
11    antenna connectors. This is how you have to make  
12    microphones and everything else beyond this equipment  
13    to operate on it. And then in some manner, that  
14    doesn't make it proprietary to one vendor or I don't  
15    think whatever flies. That kind of confuses me in  
16    this whole discussion. I think some of the concept is  
17    a good idea, but I am just not sure how you get there.

18               MR. SCHLIEMAN: I would like to make a  
19    comment. In Project 25, the statement of requirements  
20    attempted to do that with some of the accessories on a  
21    portable for instance so that the things that you plug  
22    on for a headset interfaces and programming boxes all

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1       that kind involving microphones all be the same  
2       connector so that it would not have to be unique to  
3       each particular radio. And that was, that didn't go  
4       very far. I mean it is in the SOR, but it didn't go  
5       anywhere.

6                   MR. GRIFFIN: Can I reply?

7                   MR. SCHLIEMAN: Yes, sure.

8                   MR. GRIFFIN: I didn't necessarily mean  
9       that all the hardware had to be interchangeable. But  
10      that was the concept in the North Carolina Sun. What  
11      I think the public safety people as a group, all three  
12      services want, is common resource capability which is  
13      all part of Steve Sounders presentation. And I don't  
14      want to steal his thunder, but I'll take this part of  
15      it. Why things worked as well as they did. And  
16      agree, they weren't perfect on the Pentagon thing. As  
17      they had procedures in place where there fire  
18      department, and I am going to give you bad numbers  
19      because I don't remember them.

20                   Let's say they had 100 pieces of apparatus  
21      in the Arlington County Fire Department. When this  
22      happened, they were allowed on a common resource,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 command structure go from 100 pieces of apparatus to  
2 400 because all the radios could talk to one another  
3 and they used the same language, the same Ids or  
4 whatever. I was not in New York, but from what I  
5 understand from some the presentations in New York,  
6 they had urban rescue teams that came in and until  
7 they did something, they couldn't use them. Because  
8 they weren't at all compatible. And so if you had  
9 something, in the discussion last time before we  
10 stopped. I suggested what public safety needed is  
11 what the public has now. The public has a cellular  
12 system which is compatible nationwide. And what  
13 public safety needs is a dispatch system which is  
14 compatible nationwide. Not a replacement for what you  
15 got, you still need these proprietary or privately  
16 owned systems or regional systems, whatever you got.

17 And now I am taking thoughts from  
18 yesterday afternoon's meeting because I knew this was  
19 coming up. So these are not well thought out. But I  
20 think you have a physical situation to overlay a  
21 nationwide system in a sense the cellular towers are  
22 there and there designed on a service basis. The

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 cellular people have the same motivation you have for  
2 different reasons. Say you, I don't mean you as an  
3 individual. But I am mean you as a public safety.  
4 They want the cellular phone to work in this room so  
5 they can make money when you use it. You want your  
6 portables to work in this room because if this guy had  
7 a heart attack you want to come help him.

8 The physical network is there. The towers  
9 are there. So we do a lot of tower siting consulting  
10 work. And I have yet to run into the situation where  
11 the tower people won't give you floor space, land  
12 space and tower space just for good public relations.

13 I understand the side bar conversation that is true  
14 across the whole country except for the City of New  
15 York because things are so expensive there. But I  
16 think the physical thing is there. Also, you are  
17 going to need some sort of a network to know what the  
18 telephone number is to know whatever goes into it. I  
19 think that network is in existence because the  
20 cellular phone works.

21 I think the costs, and Michael asked me to  
22 present a cost here. And I didn't do anything on this

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 basically the day before yesterday because I got told  
2 on a Friday night. I think the cost to put this up  
3 would be much less than people would expect. Because  
4 there is a lot to be gained by everybody. And I don't  
5 suggest that you start a vendor fight. There is  
6 enough vendor fights going on now. I do think it  
7 needs to be the 7-800 band megahertz some place.  
8 Because that is where people are going and there is  
9 where most of the urban systems are.

10 I also think personally and I hope that it  
11 is not cornered outside of this room, but I will say  
12 it on the record. I think the State of Virginia, the  
13 Commonwealth of Virginia is going in the wrong  
14 direction. They are going to go statewide VHF and  
15 spend boocoos of money. If this kind of concept was  
16 up they should be able to have something that works in  
17 Northern Virginia and the rest of Virginia if it is in  
18 the 800 band and on the tower. Right now, Virginia  
19 has got a bifurcated type requirements. In Norther  
20 Virginia they need to be where Northern Virginia is.

21 The rest of Virginia because of the area,  
22 they think it is cheaper to go VHF. You have an

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 overlay system in the 800 band, the could probably  
2 build the rest of the state a lot cheaper than what  
3 they are doing now. Did I answer your question,  
4 confuse you or help you? Yes. I don't want to be an  
5 advocate of this, I think there is a need from  
6 observations.

7 MR. BUCHANAN: I think you answered it.  
8 I'll just throw out a couple more comments. I think  
9 some of what you want to has been going on in the west  
10 and particularly in California in the fire service  
11 that of course, is mainly VHF because that is where  
12 the forest service does their thing. Our California  
13 Division of Forestry is at VHF. But I do know all of  
14 the fire there, when you talk about interoperability  
15 and you talk more than just communications, a fire  
16 truck in southern California can go to norther  
17 California. They can use all the same hydrants. All  
18 their stuff hooks up the same and all that kind of  
19 stuff. And they have defined a set of frequencies  
20 that should be in each VHF radio so that you will be  
21 able to talk when you get there.

22 You don't necessarily, you are not

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 necessarily able to talk on your way up and get back  
2 messages to your own folks, at least when you get  
3 there you can talk to the people that are there. How  
4 you do that, what band you do it. I think you right,  
5 if it happened, it needs to be probably even I would  
6 say at the 700 band, there isn't at least in my area,  
7 there is no spectrum left at 800 that you could even  
8 carve it out there. But you could do it think with  
9 the mutual aid at 700.

10 Beyond that, I don't know that, I know in  
11 our county, we have a Motorola trunk system and we do  
12 the same sort of things that you are seeing in this  
13 area, for everybody, not just fire. But it is also  
14 police, EMS everything is on our system and everybody  
15 can talk to everybody else. And the radios happened  
16 to be similar because we are all getting from one  
17 vendor. But I don't at all think that that is a good  
18 way to go as you say, we don't want to get into vendor  
19 wars. And we certainly want the competition out  
20 there.

21 So I am not sure how to get it started or  
22 where it goes or just even how constructed is it. Is

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1       it one or two channels of conventional use or is it  
2       envisioned as more or you know where it goes.

3               MR. GRIFFIN:    I haven't thought it all  
4       out.   I don't know, but I will give you a bunch of  
5       uncorrelated ideas.   And I would encourage whatever  
6       this next inquiry coming out of the FCC is on  
7       interoperability they ask some of the right questions  
8       on the subject.   It may or may not happen.

9               If it is nationwide, it has got to be  
10       managed by somebody.   I support John Powell, it should  
11       not be common carrier.   I said it should be common  
12       carrier light, but it shouldn't be run by the common  
13       carrier's which leads to something maybe like Air Inc.

14       Which is a non-profit organization government  
15       sanctioned that meets the national need, but it is not  
16       in the hardware business.   And it probably may or may  
17       not own that thing.   I think whatever the method of  
18       communication should not be vendor proprietary.   Which  
19       means that, I guess we have about four vendors in the  
20       market now not to mention names based on what has  
21       happened out in Phoenix.   I mean you got Motorola and  
22       you got MA/COM and you have got E.F. Johnson and you

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 got Kenwood. You basically got those four in the  
2 common market with some of us in the wings.

3 So whatever is done on this nationwide  
4 work alike, it should not be proprietary in any  
5 manner. And also I think the thing you have to face  
6 right now because of proprietariness of the systems,  
7 the price per point of communication is going over  
8 \$5,000.00 per copy. That is getting to be a lot of  
9 money to put on somebody's hip because there is no  
10 competition. The only possible competition is when  
11 you put your infrastructure in, but as soon as you buy  
12 your first site, you pay the freight, whatever it is.

13 From any of the vendors. There are no good guys and  
14 bad guys when it comes to pricing. It is money.

15 This system may or may not serve a local  
16 clustered need. I don't know, I hadn't thought that  
17 through. What I thought through is the fact that when  
18 you have an incident, you need a common resource and  
19 we are not getting there. I also support Motorola's  
20 position described in the consultant seminar last week  
21 that standards are nice. But they slow down the  
22 process because of the way of going through the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 process. I mean -- 25 started in 1991 or '92,  
2 something like that with ship three systems. I mean  
3 it is ten years to get something going.

4 There is innovation. And as Motorola  
5 avidly points out, the life cycle of what we are  
6 dealing with is three to five years. In stands  
7 process is five to ten years. So to do something like  
8 we are talking about through a standards process and  
9 no one consults the TIA, you know it is not going to  
10 work. You are going to have some organization that  
11 manages this thing in some way or the other. Where the  
12 money is going to come from and maybe it comes from  
13 different sources, I think if the public safety, I  
14 guess I looked at NPSTC. If NPSTC came out with a  
15 position paper and says the nation needs this, it  
16 would be figured out. I don't have all the answers.  
17 All I really see is that what is talked about this  
18 morning for interoperability in this room is not what  
19 worked Tuesday of this week when I looked in there  
20 regional system for interoperability.

21 Because when you talk about, I live in a  
22 practical world. I don't live here in Washington. I

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 live outside the beltway. But when you talk about  
2 interoperability and support on a regional basis, you  
3 are not talking about a conventional repeater. It  
4 doesn't work. If you have a hurricane or a tornado,  
5 you need some sort of area coverage. And so the  
6 client, and I don't want to identify the client. But  
7 we are sitting and working with on a regional system,  
8 you know, you are not going to have just a  
9 conventional channel. We have to have something that  
10 goes across. Because the big problem with the  
11 hurricane that went through there, was the public work  
12 trucks and the government trucks to get them in the  
13 right place quick enough to open the streets and get  
14 the trash out of the way.

15 I mean nobody had a gun and nothing was  
16 burning on fire. The problem was garbage. Number one  
17 when you have a hurricane or tornado. I am rambling,  
18 I hope nobody starts throwing things at me. I am  
19 going to shut up for a minute.

20 MR. DEMPSEY: I'll discuss, -- the  
21 Steering Committee meeting tomorrow so you can know  
22 what direction we should take.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Under old business, we would like to take  
2 a couple of minutes to talk about the national  
3 planning oversight committee. Something that we had  
4 suggested in our report last year, which NPSTC has  
5 taken a step further and Tom will take us there.

6 MR. TOLMAN: I just wanted to bring it up  
7 one more time. It has been a while since we last  
8 talked about this. This recommendation number 3. It  
9 was presented of May of last year, exactly a year ago  
10 I guess. And recall that in that recommendation there  
11 was discussion of assembling what would and was  
12 proposed to be a five member team and essentially two  
13 parts to it. Serving as an arbitrator between regions  
14 and bordering region areas, handling regional area  
15 disputes over frequency assignments. The applications  
16 and the rank and order that they are in. The lack of  
17 spectrum form both regions if it comes to that.

18 And the second part was the monitoring  
19 capability. That is were monitoring services among  
20 this group that the RPC process reports as the reports  
21 are being processed and any documents are being  
22 processed. We didn't really, we brought this up, but

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 this was brought up at the last NPTSC governing board  
2 meeting in January of this year brought it before the  
3 governing board to see if that was something that they  
4 felt fell within their purview. And NPSTC functions  
5 in the same similar capacity as here decisions by  
6 consensus.

7 The consensus was, that yes, this is a  
8 function or capability that the NPTSC group, however  
9 that shapes out or forms out, whoever those team  
10 members are, that five member committee. That once  
11 again NPSTC would offer in some capacity the  
12 capability to to this. It is kind of an overlap. We  
13 still think this is a tool, again and would work in  
14 conjunction with the information tools and database.  
15 And it has been a while since we last talked about it,  
16 I just wanted to bring it up one more time to see if  
17 there was any comments on that.

18 MR. DEMPSEY: Obviously our subcommittee  
19 feels strongly we made the recommendation that the  
20 continue that there be some type of oversight with the  
21 national plans and coordination. And it does sound  
22 like a very good idea to keep it in with NPSTC since

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 they are going to be managing the database.

2 And at least it is function that will stay  
3 within the same group if they, if the database  
4 administrator needs to talk to someone for a regional  
5 plan or chairman, the resources are all there to get  
6 that person to discuss the plan and to work it. So, I  
7 guess part of I guess going forward the remainder of  
8 our subcommittee, we will probably pursue that and  
9 make another recommendation.

10 I think that is about it under old  
11 business. Under new business what I would like to do  
12 is spend a few minutes discussing the first plan  
13 submitted to the FCC. Region five, Dave Buchanan's  
14 region has submitted a plan to the FCC and to quote  
15 Dick Dimboola from a couple of years ago, you know  
16 they are the first one in, the win. They are able to  
17 now, number one, they are going to be first to get  
18 picked on.

19 Number two, everybody else in that  
20 particular area now has to coordinate and plan to  
21 their plan once accepted by the FCC. So some of the  
22 things as we, the implementation subcommittee some

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 questions that we would like to get answered really  
2 partially from the FCC is what is the process going to  
3 be now that Region five has submitted their plan. And  
4 that is basically an e-mail that I had sent you. Can  
5 we get, I am sure Dave is anxious what type of time  
6 line there is and we would be willing to work with you  
7 on that. We have put together a time line document  
8 based on what we put forward in our report of a year  
9 ago.

10 As well as a regional plan element  
11 checklist. So I will forward these to you after the  
12 Steering committee. Or really, I guess assistance in  
13 this process if you would like. We would be more than  
14 willing to work with the FCC in reviewing the first  
15 plan. You know if you take an effort from us to it  
16 separately and you guys would be more than happy to do  
17 that. And there are probably going to be a couple of  
18 questions I am sure that we are going have regarding  
19 you plan and how it was put together and how it was  
20 filed. So I have asked Dave to give us a couple of  
21 minutes on what they did, why the did it and then I  
22 will open up the floor to some questions.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           MR. BUCHANAN: Well basically, everyone in  
2 my region was eager to get started even though we have  
3 a lot of issues with television stations out there.  
4 Keeping us from actually implementing systems.  
5 Particularly the state the of California, they are  
6 trying to plan for a statewide system and there are  
7 areas of the state that they can implement that aren't  
8 blocked by tv stations. But they can't do it unless  
9 the plans are in place.

10           Given all of that and just the fact that  
11 we are kind of active in all that stuff and always  
12 looking for a new spectrum anyway. We got started and  
13 worked through our plan. I know one of the issues  
14 that has been questioned is why didn't we use the  
15 national database or the packing for the national  
16 database. Basically, we support the database, we  
17 think it is very important. I have already, as Dave  
18 Funk mentioned, we sent him our plan. There was some  
19 confusion about how to get the information to  
20 actually populate the database with the frequencies  
21 and who is allocated to him. But I think we have  
22 worked that out and I will get that information to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 him.

2           However, we have a lot of experience based  
3 on our 800 planning and going way back in history as  
4 to what works and what doesn't work and who can share  
5 with who. And based on that, we thought it would be,  
6 would could get better re-use just by hand packing  
7 ourselves. So that is the direction we took. And I  
8 think if you look at the plan, you will find that  
9 there is a lot of sharing of Agencies who borders are  
10 fairly close together, but we think we, based on our  
11 experience, at 800 megahertz, we think we can make  
12 that work.

13           As far as the border to, Arizona I just  
14 getting started. I don't, I haven't heard anything  
15 out of Nevada. I am not sure where they are ate.  
16 Northern California just had meeting. So there is  
17 really nothing to coordinate on the borders. The  
18 other, probably the only thing that we are fortunate  
19 on in spectrum in southern California is that our  
20 border areas are the least populated areas of the  
21 whole region. So it is not all that much of an issue  
22 our there as to sharing with the other two states,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Arizona and Nevada. And also on the north, sharing  
2 with Northern California. So for us, and we put  
3 language in the plan that said so. We are very  
4 flexible. We will work those states and even though  
5 there, is for instance, there is 60 channels allocated  
6 to my county, San Bernardino. I don't need 60  
7 channels along the Colorado River. I may not need but  
8 one or two out there in the future.

9 So that really isn't an issue, so that is  
10 probably the other reason we didn't worry to much  
11 about having the national database packet for us. We  
12 can work around what ever comes out of the other  
13 regions. And we have had good experience working with  
14 the other three Regions in that regard. So we are not  
15 too worried about that. Beyond that, I don't know any  
16 other specific things that you would like to know  
17 about. We did try, we did look at the criteria that  
18 is posted on the FCC's web page and try to meet all of  
19 those. We did not at this time address the wide band  
20 data allocations because we just don't have enough  
21 information on particularly loading for those  
22 channels. How many units. What type of data

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 conditions can you load.

2 We are also kind of overwhelmed with, as I  
3 stated before about 700 if you break it down for  
4 requests for 50 kilohertz channels, there is about 700  
5 of them. There is only 18 or so that are allocated  
6 for general use. We would still like the FCC to break  
7 loose the reserve channel so that they can be  
8 considered all at the same time.

9 But we are also meeting in June to go over  
10 some of the wide band data and we have some ideas of  
11 how to resolve all of this and we will see how this  
12 comes out as we meet. I think the other thing with  
13 Southern California is that we have had a long, long  
14 history with working together. With coming up with  
15 ways to share spectrum. I mean we did some plans when  
16 a tv channel 16 was allocated to public safety in the  
17 L.A. area. There was a local plan done for that that  
18 is held together, I don't think it is officially  
19 sanctioned by the FCC, but we just put it together and  
20 all of our people voluntarily go by it. I guess that  
21 is why we think this can work they was it does?  
22 Questions?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1                   MR. SCHLIEMAN: Dave, Bob Schlieman. When  
2 you did your channel packing for the narrow band  
3 spectrum, what channel were you working with?

4                   MR. BUCHANAN: We actually allocated on  
5 the basis of 25 kilohertz at a time. But a given  
6 agency came to us and said, we need whatever it might  
7 be, we went back and tried to get validation as best  
8 we could, justification on why they needed that many  
9 channels. That turned into one channel per six and a  
10 quarter of kilohertz of band width. We already  
11 figured since we are held up by the tv issue that we  
12 might as well go ahead and allocate based on the  
13 assumption that the technology will be there in the  
14 future to do that. In keeping with the spirit of  
15 trying to allocate so that any technology could be  
16 used, we used 25 kilohertz blocks to each agency. So  
17 some cases meant that somebody got rounded up by a  
18 couple of extra channels, but for the main part, it is  
19 based on six and a quarter per voice channel.

20                   It was also for data because there was a  
21 lot of mobile data asked for. It was based on a  
22 mobile channel per 12.5 kilohertz. We assumed that we

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1       could get 19.2 kilobit into a 12.5 channel in the  
2       future.

3               MR. SCHLIEMAN:     In the 6.25 kilohertz  
4       channel loading that was what, 100 units per 6.25?

5               MR. BUCHANAN:    Yes.

6               MR. SCHLIEMAN:     But you were actual  
7       allotting them on the basis of 25 kilohertz blocks?

8               MR. BUCHANAN:    Right.

9               MR. SCHLIEMAN:    Okay, thanks.

10              MR. TOLMAN:    I have a question Dave.   Did  
11       you do anything unique in your plan, being first I  
12       guess you guys had the opportunity to be the example  
13       or the model of the unique integracies with dealing  
14       with the border, the Mexican border.     Is there  
15       anything unique in your plan that you have thought out  
16       in preparatory?   I know that some respects is all you  
17       can do is all you can do and that is going to be a big  
18       one.   But for those areas that are actually right down  
19       to the border and will indeed be subject to  
20       interferences, is there anything unique in your plan  
21       to prepare for that?

22              MR. BUCHANAN:    Well, the is a tough one.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Probably the only thing we did and that was based on  
2 some of the experience before we went through at 800.

3 The other thing on allocating blocks, there generally  
4 blocks of what would it be, 250 kilohertz or there  
5 about, whatever fit in between the, band is broken up  
6 between state allocations and interoperability in that  
7 it made some different walking kind of naturally fall  
8 out of that. So the agencies, all of the agencies are  
9 assigned on that basis. It is a 25 kilohertz  
10 interlead by another 25 kilohertz. It is a pretty big  
11 chunk. So it would be easy to take and say this  
12 spectrum is Mexico spectrum and this spectrum is U.S.  
13 spectrum based on our plan. We can also move the  
14 blocks around if we need to to accommodate that.  
15 Beyond that, we are just kind of waiting and hoping  
16 that the FCC will show some interest in working with  
17 Mexico and get that worked out. Because we are not  
18 assured down here that there are tv stations to block  
19 us. We don't know anything about heat and it is a big  
20 concern to San Diego County and San Diego City. Both  
21 of them need the spectrum. They can both show you the  
22 growth down there is unbelievable. And they are going

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 to need the spectrum in the future..

2 MR. DEMPSEY: I think one question that  
3 comes to mind from is, because you did your own  
4 packet, and you were one of the first people to talk  
5 about the fact that this allocation of spectrum will  
6 satisfy your immediate requirements. So when you  
7 finished your packing, what was left over?

8 MR. BUCHANAN: There was nothing left  
9 over. As a matter of fact, part of the plan, we had  
10 about five agencies with they need spectrum. They  
11 needed it for years for police type operations and one  
12 of the things we ended up having to do to make it all  
13 work is this, we told them to go talk to Los Angeles  
14 County Sheriff and the L.A. County Sheriff is in the  
15 process of putting together a new system. I think  
16 some of their direction is trending. I don't want to  
17 speak for them, but I think they are going to a trunk  
18 type system where they can handle other agencies on  
19 it. And so our plan says you go there, try to work  
20 out a deal with L.A. County. The County agreed to  
21 this. If that doesn't happen, the we have told them  
22 you can come back to the 700 meg committee and will

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 take spectrum away from LA. County to make this work.

2 So there is carrot and a stick and all that stuff.

3 But no, there is absolutely no spectrum left over.

4 And we had everyone, we asked them a set  
5 of questions to validate their requests that it was  
6 real and it wasn't overblown and everyone came back  
7 with good justifications for what they asked for. It  
8 is mainly growth in the future. But the systems that  
9 are in place now, the 800 meg spectrum that was given  
10 out, it has all been implemented. Really, the last  
11 ones to go on line has been Orange County and they're  
12 going on line with the system essentially full, and  
13 there is a lot of people that would like to I think go  
14 on, they have had requests to go on their system, but  
15 they can't fulfill them until they can see, how much,  
16 if any capacity they are going to have left over.

17 So we know we are going to need this  
18 spectrum in the future and we know in the near future  
19 to. But, obviously that may not be because of the tv  
20 stations. So no, there is nothing left over. And in  
21 wide band data, I can guarantee you there won't be  
22 anything left over we will still be scrambling.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. DEMPSEY: Any other question for Dave?

2

3 MR. TOLMAN: Steve?

4 MR. DEVINE: Steve Devine from Missouri.

5 I just got another desperate view from Missouri which  
6 is just about the opposite of everything Dave said. I  
7 have a question about his mechanism he is going to  
8 develop of or at least anticipate when the time comes  
9 for give back. I have been looking at some of the  
10 scenario's and once it is approved and went to the  
11 commission, I really had no more authority to as to  
12 even looked at accepting a letter and saying at the  
13 time we agree upon, I am going to mail this. Then  
14 your license is going to be canceled and I can make  
15 that spectrum free for other people. But the  
16 mechanism for give back is something that needs to be  
17 at least addressed probably at the local level it will  
18 be solved. But in Missouri, our plan for the most  
19 part done. We are waiting on some type of a packing  
20 program at least to view it from the database. --  
21 with the exception of an adjacent channel in Kansas  
22 City. Historically we haven't had good relationships

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 to some degree with two of our our aid adjacent  
2 states. Our border areas unfortunately are the most  
3 populated areas in the state. Not the least  
4 populated. And of course population diversity, we  
5 have 115 counties and 75% live in 25 of them. So that  
6 Kansas City and St. Louis area fortunately no  
7 international borders. So where plan wise, we are  
8 well on our way, but we are waiting to see what the  
9 results of the packing program and then we will go  
10 from there. But it should be to long after that.

11 MR. BUCHANAN: This is the first time that  
12 somebody has worse problems than me. That is great.  
13 To answer the questions on give back, this time  
14 around, we looked at it and there is really nobody  
15 that has anything to give back essentially. Because  
16 it is going to be additions to there existing systems.  
17 It is not new type large, new type systems, where  
18 there are some frequencies to give back. We did in  
19 our 800 plan we had a lot of give back frequencies.  
20 We have kept after them. And in fact, locally, we  
21 have formed what we call a give up committee that is  
22 actually still in existence. And any of the channels

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1       that come back go -- requests to get those allocated  
2       to them, went through the committee. Now this is  
3       something I suppose some of the agencies wanted to go  
4       straight to a coordinator and to the commission. The  
5       could have done it. But everyone has been very  
6       cooperative in working through the committee making  
7       sure that what they wanted is compatible and that we  
8       could pack that the best we could. And that has  
9       worked out well for us. But it only worked out  
10      because everyone cooperates.

11               And there is language in our 800 plan that  
12      they have to give back frequencies and everyone has  
13      been pretty good about doing that. Some of them took  
14      a while, obviously Orange County because they got  
15      delayed with Bankruptcy and a lot of things, they are  
16      just now able to start giving back the channels and  
17      letting other people use. But they did let people  
18      actually license on those channels under the agreement  
19      that they wouldn't come on the air until Orange County  
20      can do it. That is the best I can tell you on that  
21      Steve.

22               MR. DEMPSEY: You know, I think because we

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 are such strong proponents of the data base, I heard  
2 some questions about you know, why you didn't use the  
3 data base. I think your packing explanation, and  
4 there is two parts to the question because the data  
5 base and the packing are really two separate entities.

6 The packing is essentially in the case  
7 when Steve talks about the state of Missouri, they are  
8 going to use the packing because it is a good way for  
9 them to do their allocations. In your case --

10 MR. DEVINE: We are going to base our  
11 decision after we see it for yourself.

12 MR. BUCHANAN: You know, I think we had  
13 requests and they were legitimate requests for mor  
14 channels and they were from specific agencies. And  
15 they are not from, they are not uniformed throughout  
16 the region. For instance, we had no requests from  
17 several counties, Kern County, Santa Barbara, St.  
18 Louis, Abysbo, those folks, they are just not at the  
19 point where they can care about any immediate  
20 allocation. That is not to say that we still look at  
21 them and we can help them in the future when they need  
22 it. But we did have, as always, our requests are from

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 that L.A. Basin area that includes L.A. County, Orange  
2 County, San Bernardino and Riverside Counties, Ventura  
3 and then of course your San Diego County and City.  
4 And based on all that that is what really drove us  
5 because we knew as I said from past experience, what  
6 would work, what wouldn't and how we can actually pack  
7 things closer together that typically you don't get  
8 even looking at some terrain based packing. So that  
9 drove it.

10 Also the program wasn't ready and you know  
11 at that time. However, as I say, we are going to put  
12 our data in and the data base we will use and we think  
13 that is very important. And we want to have that, in  
14 fact we think that is a good tool to protect everybody  
15 from mistakes. Because we did have one, I can tell  
16 you one instance that we worked out with Arizona, but  
17 as they did their 800 plan, they submitted an  
18 allocation to us. We signed off on that. They sent  
19 the whole thing in to the FCC, but the FCC because  
20 they didn't use that one program that was being used  
21 at the time back then, made them go back and redo it.  
22 And when it got redone, it didn't get re-coordinated

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and there ended up some conflicts and we had to work  
2 those out. So as I see it, that data base is going to  
3 be very important so that we don't have those  
4 conflicts on the border. And also so we can keep  
5 track. Because it is real hard with the 800 plans to  
6 keep track of the changes on the border, you just  
7 don't know. This way you can just go in there and  
8 look and make sure you are not doing something  
9 contrary.

10 MR. DEMPSEY: Well, I think your plan  
11 being the first in that area too, now everyone has to  
12 coordinate with you. And I don't mean it in the,  
13 trying to be first on the block. But in a sense, you  
14 sent your plan in motion and if it is approved before  
15 Northern California or Arizona or now the coordination  
16 becomes an issue of they have to use the data base to  
17 look at the data base and see where they can put --

18 MR. BUCHANAN: Exactly.

19 MR. DEVINE: One of the benefits of the  
20 packing program was there was the potential based on  
21 some of the statistics in the PSWAC use curve and  
22 populations census data, etc. That they might

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 insulate areas that are slow in developing and there  
2 might be some insulation there to preserve it in St.  
3 Louis. For example, the 800 allocation, the 800  
4 allotment -- Missouri has 3/4 the population and 1/4  
5 the spectrum in the Metropolitan St. Louis area  
6 because they were last. So, just to avoid that, I  
7 don't want to be on the first side of that. I don't  
8 want to be on the good side of that, but if it was  
9 done proportionally, it would be effective and more  
10 efficient. So that is what is lacking and if the  
11 packing program as the ability to insulate some area  
12 that might be slow in developing, I am all for that.

13 MR. DEMPSEY: One more question. Since  
14 you had real requests. It wasn't an issue where you  
15 were going to pack this and they were going to be an  
16 allotment for a couple of the counties that you  
17 mentioned that just don't have an interest. How are  
18 they protected in your plan? Or I shouldn't say  
19 protected because that is not a good terminology to  
20 use in this case. How were they included in your plan  
21 and you started to talk about that. You know, they  
22 are not interested in spectrum right now, but they are

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 going to come back to you in two or three years when  
2 things change or maybe longer than that and say, hey  
3 guys we need some spectrum.

4 MR. BUCHANAN: I am trying to keep the two  
5 plans separate, you know the differences. I am not  
6 sure this time if we actually put in a specific  
7 allocation, I know in the 800 we did. But there are  
8 counties that again are on the border, so  
9 traditionally there is just no way that the population  
10 is sparse enough on both sides of the border that  
11 there is no way that there wouldn't be spectrum left  
12 that is useable in those counties.

13 I think in the case of what Steve was  
14 saying is that he had a big population base that had  
15 to come along last and try to get something that  
16 wasn't there. In this case, it is going to be there  
17 they just need to come and ask for it.

18 MR. DEMPSEY: So their allotments --

19 MR. BUCHANAN: By default if nothing else.  
20 Also the plan, our plan and the way we do it as far  
21 as future requests, anyone that wants to come in later  
22 and ask for an allotment can do so. All they have to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 do is come in and show that they won't interfere with  
2 the other folks that and co- and adjacent channel on  
3 those plans and they have the whole mechanism set up  
4 in that. So you can grow to, where you can fit it in.

5 And that, again, is based on the way that  
6 we have been pretty successful in the 800 plan of  
7 doing it. So it is not a case of you have to come and  
8 break down barriers to get in. You just come and ask  
9 us at any time. It is not where we are opening  
10 windows or anything else.

11 MR. MURPHY: You're right.

12 MR. SCHLIEMAN: Could have given a shorter  
13 answer and said nope.

14 MR. MURPHY: Seriously, we don't have an  
15 answer to that question.

16 MR. DEMPSEY: I guess we could talk about  
17 tomorrow at the Steering Committee meeting. And maybe  
18 more formalize something for the Steering Committee.

19 MR. DEMPSEY: Bob brought up that one of  
20 the items that we discussed earlier was making a  
21 recommendation for NPSTC to pursue the planning  
22 oversight committee issue. And I guess we should get

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 consensus at the meeting that is something we should  
2 recommend forward to the Steering Committee. Spend a  
3 brief moment getting consensus.

4 MR. DEVINE: Two quick questions. I want  
5 to ask Dave, was his application submitted  
6 electronically?

7 MR. BUCHANAN: Yes.

8 MR. DEVINE: Okay, and is that going to be  
9 a mechanism fro which we are going to be capable of  
10 submitting our plans, I should say, electronically?  
11 There will be a mechanism for that, is that safe to  
12 say?

13 MR. DEMPSEY: I'm not --

14 MR. DEVINE: If this all ties into the  
15 data base and the Regional Plan residing on the data  
16 base and if there is a mechanism for it to reside  
17 there and be modified and that to be part of the  
18 submission process that also might expedite things  
19 like we discussed earlier. So I don't know whether --

20 MR. DEMPSEY: Is that meaning submission  
21 to the FCC?

22 MR. DEVINE: Well, if the criteria that

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the plan has to be approved when it has been changed,  
2 I know we discussed minor changes that might not  
3 require complete submission, but if electronic  
4 submission is an option, it might be able to come as  
5 .pdf or whatever format David is working in. It might  
6 be something that might be an option as well, so.

7 MR. DEMPSEY: And maybe I am just missing  
8 something. An option to submit the plan the FCC or to  
9 --

10 MR. DEVINE: If the plan is changed on the  
11 data base --

12 MR. DEMPSEY: Correct.

13 MR. DEVINE: Then the plan has to be  
14 submitted to the FCC and it can be submitted  
15 electronically?

16 MR. DEMPSEY: Yes.

17 MR. DEVINE: Can it be submitted from the  
18 data base to the FCC?

19 MR. SCHLIEMAN: I think the plan isn't  
20 official until it is accepted by the Commission. At  
21 that point, you can submit it to the data base as  
22 being the plan.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1                   MR. DEVINE: I see, okay. Approval before  
2 submission to the data base?

3                   MR. SCHLIEMAN: Yes.

4                   MR. DEVINE: One other question, I would  
5 be remiss in mentioning it. The state license  
6 spectrum currently the data base will hold locations  
7 for the state license spectrum. However, there is no  
8 methodology proposed to coordinate interstate between  
9 that. That has been basically left up to the states  
10 to work out, having 8 of them, I have more concern  
11 than most for that perhaps. But I would like to make  
12 sure that the implementation committee is aware of the  
13 fact that the state license spectrum right now has no  
14 mechanism within the data base, although it will hold  
15 information, certainly no mechanism for a coordination  
16 on an interstate basis.

17                  MR. SCHLIEMAN: I might comment that in  
18 New York State we are faced with a similar problem,  
19 not quite as great a magnitude. All though we have  
20 some very close boundaries between adjacent states.  
21 And we are trying to work our a plan that equitably  
22 shares the spectrum considering the tv situation and

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 everything else. I suggest that maybe we ought to  
2 work together to polish that a little bit and present  
3 it at the next meeting.

4 MR. DEVINE: Once again, with the  
5 geographic nature of those channels, if there was  
6 method for me to insulate Missouri and Kansas once  
7 they get a certain distance within Kansas, they can do  
8 what they like as far as I am concerned.

9 MR. SCHLIEMAN: That is exactly right.  
10 That is the way we are playing it. It is just the  
11 border area.

12 MR. COLTRI: I am a little confused. If  
13 the plan doesn't get posted onto the data base until  
14 after it is approved by the FCC, how do other regions  
15 who are in the stage of developing their plan and they  
16 are adjacent, have the latest information about what  
17 their neighbors are doing.

18 MR. TOLMAN: Please come to the mic Dave.

19 MR. FUNK: The approved plan, its final  
20 format, it is done in .pdf and that is the on the FCC  
21 has approved and is finally there. The data base will  
22 allow the RPC chair to post whatever plans in progress

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 or whatever status he wants to. The data base will  
2 actually accept documents posted up for review by  
3 Regional Planning Committees from all over the country  
4 in either a word type format or a .pdf. And we  
5 anticipate that if you are posting one in a .pdf  
6 format that you don't want changed, that people would  
7 be able to look at. That it would be marked, interim  
8 plan or something of that nature. Certainly the  
9 final plan once approved by the FCC, that plan will  
10 stay there. We have the ability of locking that plan  
11 as this is Colorado's plan. That is the one that will  
12 live out there until we get some official word that  
13 that plan has been changed. At which time we can open  
14 that to having that RPC chair be able to go in and  
15 submit that new and approved FCC plan.

16 But the process is there that you can  
17 actually put in .pdf files. You can put in word  
18 documents for manipulation and people can actually  
19 download those, look at them, change them and  
20 depending on the status of you as a user, whether you  
21 are the RPC chair having the final authority, your if  
22 you have designated others within your regional

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 planning group as regional planners, they may have the  
2 authority to upload documents to that working file if  
3 you will and so the data base will facilitate that  
4 very nicely for those planning reviews.

5 MR. O'HARA: Steve Devine asked a question,  
6 earlier. I am not sure I made it all the way through  
7 to the answer on it. So I will ask it again. If once  
8 the initial plan as been accepted by the FCC and it  
9 goes into the data base. A year down the road the  
10 plan gets major modifications to it, could that plan  
11 be submitted to the FCC through the data base or what  
12 vehicle would you want to see for re-submission of  
13 that plan?

14 MR. DEMPSEY: Well right now, if you are  
15 talking about a major modification. Major  
16 modification is going to have to go through the FCC  
17 before it can come to the data base. So before any  
18 change, I mean in this case, I think the data base as  
19 the ability to put an interim plan in there. I am not  
20 sure though if you would be able to post changes to  
21 the plan, and Dave you will have to clarify that for  
22 me. In other words, your plan is approved, it is out

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1       there Sean, now six months go by there is going to be  
2       a modification.

3               Well that modification at this present  
4       time is going to have to be approved by the FCC. So,  
5       something that Dave should talk about I guess is can  
6       that proposed modification be placed on, and I think  
7       it can, because we had a lot of discussion about this.

8       If there is a proposed modification to the plan, it  
9       can be posted for comment in the databases, I guess  
10      the best way to describe it. But before it becomes  
11      the plan, or the modification is approved, the FCC is  
12      going to have approve that modification. Especially  
13      when you use that word major modification.

14             MR. FUNK:     The concept of the plan  
15      submittal to the FCC comes from the RPC. The data  
16      base is not built with any kind of automated  
17      submission process from the planning site to the FCC.

18      So the concept again, is that the RPC prepares that  
19      document, they can post it on the data base for review  
20      and comments and all of the kinds of facilitating  
21      suggested changes. If we were at the point it can be  
22      posted out there in word document formats. They can

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 be reviewed and changed and altered and then when  
2 those are taken, the RPC chair submits those to the  
3 FCC in whatever fashion it is defined to do that. If  
4 it is in actual hard copy format or if it is  
5 electronic, obviously that facilitates the whole  
6 process.

7 When those have been approved, the RPC  
8 chair is apprised of that by the FCC. He can go in  
9 and post those approved plans back to the data base.  
10 Only the RPC chair for the given region can actually  
11 post that final plan out to the data base. And once  
12 that is done, that again then becomes the new final  
13 plan. And it is locked until such another exchange  
14 might happen.

15 MR. FUNK: I think that the other thing  
16 to, is that since this is not mandatory, the use of  
17 the data base is not mandatory, there really is no  
18 mechanism for us to force a region to forward interim  
19 plans, changes of plans, modifications. There is  
20 nothing we can do to force, we are actually relying on  
21 the fact that Dave's relationship with Northern  
22 California, would say, if you post yours and I post

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 mine, we can work together and we can work together  
2 with Arizona. The issue that we have always been  
3 concerned about is that if Arizona doesn't want to  
4 play in the sandbox --

5 MR. TOLMAN: We're also relying on the  
6 commitments that we have had from each of the  
7 coordinators. The four coordinators have given us  
8 their assurance at this stage and at this juncture the  
9 enforcement, if you will, or the process will pass  
10 through and must past through one of the four  
11 coordinators.

12 Also, as a reminder in this three year  
13 process to get to this point, every step of the way  
14 this thing has been built according to the four  
15 coordinators and the key regional planning committee  
16 membership that was served as the advisory group. So,  
17 once again it isn't anybody going off and building  
18 anything in a direction that wasn't in compliance with  
19 the four coordinators and the regional planning  
20 development team.

21 MR. DEMPSEY: And I think the way we wrote  
22 the guidelines it forces, obviously coordination with

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the other regions. So you have got show what level of  
2 coordination you did with the other regions. And I  
3 think the only way, the most efficient way is to do it  
4 is through the use of the data base.

5 MR. PICKERAL: Ted you brought up an  
6 excellent point, in terms of of news items that I am  
7 going to insert in here since the last NCC meeting.  
8 As you recall last year, both the Pisman Program and  
9 John Powell individually filed petitions for  
10 reconsideration for the fourth report and order in  
11 which the commission said it would not mandate use of  
12 the data base. Since that time, I believe I was  
13 February or March the commission has come out with an  
14 MO&O and I won't paraphrase or editorialize on it. It  
15 is out there to look at on WC docket 96-86. Again  
16 reaffirming that it is not at least at this juncture  
17 going to mandate use of that data base. So right now  
18 they are kind of still apples and oranges. There is  
19 submittance and there is a data base but there are not  
20 officially or technically linked in anyway.

21 MR. DEMPSEY: But I think the way to just  
22 kind of conclude on that to help this point along. Is

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1       that the ways the guidelines have been written, it is  
2       strong enough to sort of those plans have to be out  
3       there in the data base. They have to be coordinated  
4       with the other regions and the border regions. So  
5       even though it is not mandatory, I still believe it  
6       should be mandatory, I think it is still strong enough  
7       where the FCC looks at that plan and sees that there  
8       was no coordination between Southern California and  
9       Arizona, that they have every opportunity now to  
10      reject that plan. Whether it is Dave' plan that they  
11      reject or Arizona.

12               In this case, I mean, again, going back to  
13      Dick Dimboola's theory of you are the first one in,  
14      everyone has to coordinate to Dave's plan. But  
15      speaking to Dave to, that there is, he is going to  
16      have to work with them to get this approved. It is  
17      not the most ideal way that we had wanted it to work,  
18      but I think it is better than what we would of had had  
19      we not had a database.

20               MR. BUCHANAN: Just follow up. That is  
21      exactly correct and or plan specifically said in it  
22      that we will work with the other regions and that we

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1       were using the data base. So that is the two things  
2       we put in there. But you are right, under the FCC  
3       rules, technically I guess you don't have to. But we  
4       don't see that gains us anything not to. It is far  
5       better to play in the sandbox with everybody else.

6                   MR. DEMPSEY: Forgive me Don.

7                   MR. EIERMAN: We have a couple of other  
8       issues that --

9                   MR. DEMPSEY: Comment --

10                  MR. GRIFFIN: It has been brought to my  
11       attention in this planning process and it hasn't come  
12       up in this committee meeting so, maybe everybody knows  
13       it, but if you look at the curve on spectrum  
14       efficiency and trunking. The more channels you can  
15       put together in the system, the more efficient, the  
16       more through put you can get through. For example,  
17       three five channel systems can only have so much  
18       through put, So much traffic. A 15 channel system as  
19       one system will put more through put rather as  
20       compared to the three. And following that logic, when  
21       you do your planning and I am not sure this is in the  
22       guidebook, because it hasn't been discussed here, if

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 you look at the standard metropolitan districts, and  
2 kind of steal a little bit from the what the FCC did  
3 on the cellular allocations

4 But I think what we really can go back to the  
5 Commission right now and say hey, there may not be  
6 much preliminary indication, there might not be much  
7 advantage, but we think there needs to be more  
8 analysis and offer that we would do this from TIA  
9 standpoint.

10 MR. NASH: Wayne, is that something TIA is  
11 willing to take on?

12 MR. LELAND: We've got the right people  
13 here. We have got John and I am sure that we would  
14 take that on. Because, you know Bob is right, it is  
15 not a simple do A and everything gets solved. That  
16 has come up here. It is a balance of several  
17 parameters. And it is all of those trade offs and you  
18 have got to come to the right --.

19 You may want to for this meeting to take  
20 Bob's suggestion and ask that TIA look at this and get  
21 back to you before the next NCC meeting. Which is  
22 when, next September? Which I think we should be able

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to do. Everybody nodding their head. Otherwise I get  
2 my hammer out and I beat them. And secondly, you may  
3 want to, or maybe you don't, but you may want to say  
4 raising the noise, raising the desired signal level  
5 may be a that should be left on the table as an option  
6 for system designers, pending what TIA comes out with.

7 You may also want to strongly endorse,  
8 limiting out of band emissions by whoever wins the  
9 auction in that spectrum. I mean that is the net we  
10 believe that is the -- cause. These other things are  
11 defensive. Given that that rit cause is going to take  
12 place, what can you do. Well you can design nil  
13 receivers then you don't get cross band, you don't get  
14 806 coupled with 746 radios. And you can raise the  
15 signal strength which you get all these other  
16 problems. But the root cause the potential  
17 interference from out of band emissions of the auction  
18 winners in the adjacent 700 MHZ spectrum.

19 MR. NASH: Now earlier, I heard a  
20 suggestion that we perhaps have a Region A, Region B  
21 standard. You now, urban/suburban rural somehow, you  
22 know separation between the two. Because I will admit

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 in trying to design the suburban rural type systems.  
2 Having to design it for higher signal levels is going  
3 have a significant cost impact on the number of sites  
4 that would have to be implemented and the potential  
5 problems of not being able to implement the additional  
6 sites because of other concerns that you get into, but  
7 Mike brings up that we chastised Michael yesterday by  
8 another one of your cohorts. All of the NEPA  
9 requirements with the FCC is putting on us also. So,

10 MR. LELAND: We can look at those aspects  
11 as well Glen with the TIA. The only comment I would  
12 make is with what we are learning now in 800 and 700  
13 without some kind of solution here, it is going to be  
14 difficult for system designers and manufacturers to  
15 come up with 90 guarantees or whatever. So it is  
16 going to make life tough unless you have some tools,  
17 like raising a signal strength or whatever. But it is  
18 not a simple issue.

19 MR. NASH: Norm?

20 MR. COLTRI: Norm Coltri, RCC Consultants.  
21 Basically what we are doing is masking a problem and  
22 I really don't think masking is the right way to solve

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 a problem. But, I think it is good if we can do some  
2 further research into it. Also I think Michael  
3 brought up a very good point that I think deserves  
4 some additional consideration by the committee, about  
5 the 700 band. And whether mixing technologies would  
6 be causing the same type of problem. And I think that  
7 is a definite possibility. That if we do get into a  
8 situation where we are masking the signal levels by  
9 having cellular type operations intermixed with noise  
10 limited type of operations within the same segment of  
11 the 700 band, public safety could be causing problems  
12 to itself. And I think it might be something to look  
13 at where we may suggest that the different  
14 technologies start at different ends of the band and  
15 move into the center. Rather than intermixing the  
16 different technologies within the same band. I know  
17 it was mentioned we have frequency coordination is  
18 supposed to solve that problem, but, maybe taking a  
19 proactive approach at the beginning by segregating the  
20 technology at 700 may be a way to off set some of the  
21 potential problems that might develop.

22 MR. NASH: Other comments? Norm, I

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 understand and I too have concerns about mixing  
2 technologies. I kind of have to fall back though on  
3 my experience in government of in trying to justify  
4 and get funding for a new system, and through the  
5 entire, if you will, life cycle of actually installing  
6 a new system. The money people want to have assurance  
7 that you have the spectrum in order to get the money  
8 and so you find yourself, first getting the spectrum,  
9 then getting the money. Then going out to bid, which  
10 defines the technology you are going to use. Which  
11 now puts you back in what you are suggesting of going  
12 back and asking for different spectrum because the  
13 technology isn't in the appropriate part of the band.

14 You know it is not going to be an easy  
15 thing to try to deal with. And certainly the  
16 frequency coordination issues in this band where we  
17 are looking at having some significantly different  
18 technologies is a new challenge for us. And I am not  
19 sure how to approach it.

20 MR. COLTRI: You are correct in your  
21 description of how things were done in the past. But  
22 I think the regional planning committees have to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 change a little bit of the way they are operating. I  
2 think there has to be some innovations. The original  
3 planning committee knows a block of spectrum that they  
4 have to work with and they know a certain number of  
5 channels are available for assignment in their area.

6 When an agency comes to them, they can  
7 block out a certain number of channels, not in any  
8 specific part of the band, but just in a number we  
9 will give such an agency five channels and they mark  
10 it in their book. And they keep track of those five  
11 channels, not is specific RF, but in channel blocks.  
12 Let the agency go through their procurement process,  
13 their fund acquisition process. Then come back to the  
14 committee later and say okay, I would like to turn  
15 these five channel blocks into RF frequencies. The  
16 committee now assigns the frequencies based on the  
17 technology.

18 So there is ways to work around this.  
19 This is not the way we are normally doing business,  
20 but it is possible to make it work. This also gives  
21 the committee better control over the frequency  
22 because if an agency fails to get the funding or fails

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to procure the system, they haven't assigned an actual  
2 FCC license. It is being held at the committee level,  
3 not at the FCC level. And it is easier to do a take  
4 back. So there are a lot of pluses in doing it that  
5 way. But it does require more work on the part of the  
6 committee on more work on part of the database to  
7 maintain frequency blocks rather than actual RF  
8 channels.

9 MR. NASH: And David correct me, we sort  
10 of got into the discussion about 2 years ago when we  
11 were talking about receiver standards. And one of the  
12 things that we came up with, was well, it didn't seem  
13 to make a lot of difference because the transmitter  
14 standard was a -- as to the amount of noise that could  
15 be put into the adjacent six and quarter kilohertz  
16 channel. And so the receiver standard wasn't too  
17 critical because the burden was placed on the  
18 transmitter regardless of what type of modulation or  
19 band width it had. Is that a correct recollection?

20 I am looking at David Eierman here who is  
21 trying to think back two years.

22 MR. BUCHANAN: I'll throw in mine. My

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 understanding is that TSB 88 process takes care of  
2 those issues of different, it defines the ration  
3 needed for the different types of technology. So it  
4 becomes a mute issue.

5 MR. NASH: But TSB 88 requires you now to  
6 go back. In order to implement TSB 88, you have to  
7 know what the technology is in each of the two  
8 channels that are being considered.

9 MR. BUCHANAN: Right.

10 MR. NASH: Which gets us back into this  
11 problem of the reality of how public safety systems  
12 are funded, designed and implemented.

13 MR. COLTRI: Norm Coltri again. One of  
14 the biggest problems we are seeing with the 800  
15 interference is not as much out of band as it is  
16 receiver overload. Where a receiver moves into an  
17 area which is very close to one of the cell sites. It  
18 is pumping out a lot of RF to get coverage into the  
19 immediate vicinity, the receiver loses sensitivity  
20 because of front end overload.

21 That type of interference is going to be  
22 present no matter what we look at as far as, we could

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 be megahertz away and still have receiver front end  
2 overload. So it is not something that we are going to  
3 be able to do an analysis of that site based upon the  
4 TSB 88. Because we are looking at a system that is  
5 not specific to an RF frequency, but to a general  
6 overload of a multitude of RF channels at a specific  
7 site putting out a lot of RF power. And having those  
8 sites dotted all over the coverage area of a noise  
9 limited system.

10 And if we have that same thing in public  
11 safety, where we have a cellular type of system, for  
12 example, a city has a cellular type of system. They  
13 put in a TETRA type system. And they populate that  
14 city with maybe 50 or 60 sites. Each one covering a  
15 radius of two or three miles with a lot of RF to get  
16 in building coverage. And now the county has a noise  
17 limited system. Well every time one of the county  
18 cars is in the city and passes one of those city  
19 cites, it is going to have front end overload. And  
20 the only way to really get away from that is to have  
21 the system separated by enough frequency separation so  
22 that we don't have that problem. And I am thinking

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1       that if we start at the each end of the band, we would  
2       at least have a shot of doing that. Without having the  
3       technology separate it, intermixing the technology,  
4       the overload is going to be there.

5               MR. BUCHANAN: That's getting away --

6               MR. NASH: Yes, it's getting away from the  
7       question here. Any other questions or any other  
8       comments? Kind of what I gathered is the, you know,  
9       the consensus, short answer here. It is not a simple  
10      answer. Raising the received signal level is going to  
11      resolve our interference problems. There are several  
12      factors that must be balanced. Nonetheless on the  
13      surface, it does not appear to offer a significant  
14      advantage in the operation of public safety systems.  
15      And that at this point we recommend referring it to  
16      TIA for technical review and comment. Is that the  
17      general? Can I get clear consensus on --

18              MR. SCHLIEMAN: Yes, and I would add also  
19      in addition to the analysis include impact on public  
20      safety. In the larger sense of how much more is going  
21      to be required in siting and so on, costs.

22              MR. LELAND: Cost you can't do, a number

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 of sites and things we can't do.

2 MR. NASH: okay, so if the analysis  
3 included discussion of the impact of the design of  
4 public safety systems?

5 MR. LELAND: Why don't you also add Glen  
6 to the completed prior to the next NCC meeting in  
7 September.

8 MR. NASH: That is fine by me. To be  
9 included, report to be submitted on or before the --  
10 okay. Any other additions to the consensus opinion?  
11 Okay, I will declare consensus opinion reached. And I  
12 will report so to the Steering Committee tomorrow.  
13 Actually we have gotten quite a bit accomplished here  
14 in our hour so far. That was the main three things  
15 that I had on my list of things for this committee to  
16 deal with. Are there other items to be discussed?

17 I will reiterate that there was a  
18 gentlemen contacted me from a company that wanted to  
19 make a presentation about new technology. He said he  
20 was going to be here at this meeting. Well he might  
21 be here a little late, so. Teddy we might have  
22 somebody you wants to make a presentation during your

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 meeting. Would that, I guess we will look at  
2 adjourning this meeting.

3 MR. EIERMAN: During the, just one little  
4 quick comment, during the PSWC Project, many years  
5 ago, some of us were daring enough to suggest that  
6 with all the reforming. We look at eventually moving  
7 public safety to one continuous piece of spectrum.  
8 You didn't care where, we just discussed that. And of  
9 course we got representatives from the state of  
10 Montana that still didn't want to give up their low  
11 band systems because they put that power up in the  
12 middle of the state and they were covered.

13 They were very happy. The guys from New  
14 York city were screaming and yelling and saying no, we  
15 can't use low band. We couldn't even get public  
16 safety to agree to be in one band. So, it is a very  
17 aggressive. My only feeling is I don't know how we  
18 are going to get us to agree to move into one band,  
19 let along FCC or anyone else.

20 (Whereupon, the hearing in the above-  
21 entitled matter was concluded at 3:14 p.m.)

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701